



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,489	12/22/2003	M. Charlotte Baltus	117428	2063
27074	7590	01/27/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			TSUI, WILSON W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/740,489	BALTUS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Wilson Tsui	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/22/2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/17/2005.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Detailed Action

1. This action is in response to application filed on December 22, 2003.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1, 7, and 12 are independent claims.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

There is a spelling mistake in paragraph 0006, where the word “accesses” should be “accessed” instead.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 13, 14, 15, and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

There is a typographic error since claims 13, 14, 15, and 16 indicate “the processor of claim 12”, where instead, claims 13, 14, 15, and 15 should indicate “the system of claim 12”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002).

With regards to claim 1, Ball et al teaches a method for highlighting changes in an information object comprising:

- *Identifying a user.* Referring to Figure 5, it is shown that each user is identified such that hot list items are linked to each user. Ball et al further elaborates upon this detail by saying that “the invention maintains a table … (along with) … a list of pages or documents, owned by each user (paragraph 0086)”. Thus, for a document-to-user mapping be possible, it is inherent that each user has been identified.
- *Obtaining a selected version of an information object requested by the user.* Ball et al. teaches a repository which stores the original set of documents that a user may request (paragraph 0049: whereas, the original pages are located in a repository, for which Ball et al’s system periodically checks against for changes). Furthermore, there is a hotlist associated with each user, for which each hotlist

identifies the pages of interest being requested (paragraph 0048: "a hotlist identifies pages ... as being of interest to (a) user"). The pages of interest indicated by the user are then obtained and stored on a server/computing system (paragraph 0048: whereas, pages A and B are retrieved from a repository and stored in the external service (the external service comprises: a computer, software, and communication system)).

- *Obtaining a previous version of the information object based on a result of identifying the user, and determining a difference between the selected version of the information object and the previous version of the information object:*
Previous version(s) of the page(s) requested by the identified user are stored together with subsequent changes as indicated in Fig 3, reference number 6 (paragraph 0055). To retrieve a previous version, along with the selected version of the information object; an application is used to compare both versions and determine the differences between them (paragraph 0052: whereas, W3Newer is a preferred application to determine the differences between the two versions).
- *Outputting a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference:* A program used to perform the highlighting, is used to "generate an image shown in Fig 4" (paragraph 0059: output of rendered version is shown in the figure 4 screen shot) such that the image "represents changes, and contains material not present in the previous version of the page, but which has been added (paragraph 0061)". To highlight the changes, a "particular font, particular size, particular color, and particular background (paragraph 0061)" may be used.

With regards to claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. teaches a method further comprises, *automatically obtaining a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user*. Anytime there is a change in the original document/page, a new version number is generated (paragraph 0053-0054: whereas, it is described that “when changes are found, the invention stores them in the external service (computer/server)”). Furthermore, Ball et al’s system keeps track of the last time a user has accessed a particular document/page (paragraph 0074: whereas, “as users access the pages, block 35 (of Fig 6) monitors the times of the accesses, in order to identify which versions of each page the user viewed last”). The tracking data is then used to obtain the version of the document/page that was most recently accessed by the user (paragraph 0076-0077: whereas, there are two versions described, such that version 1 is the document most recently accessed by the identified user, and version 2 is the up-to-date copy of the original. Bell et al’s invention then obtains a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user since, at the time of access for the selected document/page, “the invention presents version 1, plus the changes which make version 2”).

With regards to claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. teaches a method further comprises, *displaying the rendered version of the information*: The rendered version of the information is rendered for display in a browser application (Figure 4: whereas, changes are highlighted/mark in the document (in this case, highlights

include italics, cross-outs, asterisks, and more) that were selected for access by the user and displayed in a browser application as shown in the screen shot)

With regards to claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al teaches a method further comprises, *the selected version of the information object is a current version of the information object and is automatically selected*: The selected information object as indicated in a hotlist is used to inform the external service (computer/server) of the specific page(s) to retrieve from the repository (paragraphs 0042 and 0047-0049: whereas, the repository stores the original documents/pages, and an external service (computer/server) is used to retrieve data from the repository). Furthermore, the computer/server will retrieve the most recent version from the repository and repeatedly run comparison routines (such as CRC or time stamp checks) between the computer/server and the repository (paragraph 0049: whereas, “the invention periodically examines the original (documents/pages) located in the repository for changes” and “In looking for changes, the invention first performs a preliminary check, based on information such as ... dates of modification and ... checksums”). Should a difference be found through a comparison routine, the computer/server will note the changes and automatically retrieve the latest version from the repository (paragraph 0059: “When user 1 wishes to view page A, the (external service) ordinarily retrieves and presents the current version”).

With regards to claim 12, Ball et al teaches a system for highlighting changes in an information object comprising:

- *Means for identifying a user* as by referring to Figure 5, it is shown that each user is identified such that hot list items are linked to each user. Ball et al further elaborates upon this detail by saying that "the invention maintains a table ... (along with) ... a list of pages or documents, owned by each user (paragraph 0086)". Thus, for a document-to-user mapping to be possible, it is inherent that each user has been identified.
- *Means for obtaining a selected version of the information object that was requested by the user*: An external service (computer/server which inherently has a processor) is used to access a repository of information including the original set of documents a user may request (paragraph 0049: whereas, the original pages are located in a repository, for which the external service periodically checks against for changes). The external service then collects hotlist information associated with each user, to identify the selected page(s) of interest (paragraph 0048: "a hotlist identifies pages ... as being of interest to (a) user"). The selected page(s) for each user are then obtained (paragraph 0048: whereas, the external service retrieves pages A and B from a repository and stores them in itself).
- *Means for obtaining a previous version of the information object based on a result of identifying the user*: Anytime there is a change in the original document/page, the external service (computer/server which inherently has a processor) generates a new version number (paragraph 0053-0054: whereas, it

is described that "when changes are found, the invention stores them in the external service (computer/server)". Furthermore, the external service keeps track of the last time a user has accessed a particular document/page (paragraph 0074: whereas, "as users access the pages, block 35 (of Fig 6) monitors the times of the accesses, in order to identify which versions of each page the user viewed last"). The tracking data is then used to obtain the version of the document/page that was most recently accessed by the user (paragraph 0076-0077: whereas, there are two versions described, such that version 1 is the document of most recently accessed by the identified user, and version 2 is the up-to-date copy of the original. The external service then obtains a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user since, at the time of access for the selected document/page, "the invention presents version 1, plus the changes which make version 2"). Thus, the processor has accessed/retrieved version 1 (the previous version of the information object).

- *Means for determining a difference between the selected version of the information object and the previous version of the information object:* Previous version(s) of the page(s) requested by the identified user are stored together with subsequent changes as indicated in Fig 3, reference number 6 (paragraph 0055). Retrieving a previous version, along with the selected version of the information object, an application is used to compare both versions and determine the differences between them (paragraph 0052: whereas, W3Newer is a preferred application to determine the differences between the two versions).

- *Means for outputting a rendered version of the information object showing the difference:* A program used to perform the highlighting, is used to “generate an image shown in Fig 4 (paragraph 0059: output of rendered version is shown in the figure 4 screen shot)” such that the image “represents changes, and contains material not present in the previous version of the page, but which has been added (paragraph 0061)”. To highlight the changes, a “particular font, particular size, particular color, and particular background (paragraph 0061)” may be used.

With regards to claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, for *automatically obtaining a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the user*. Anytime there is a change in the original document/page, a new version number is generated (paragraph 0053-0054: whereas, it is described that “when changes are found, the invention stores them in the external service (computer/server)”). Furthermore, Ball et al’s system keeps track of the last time a user has accessed a particular document/page (paragraph 0074: whereas, “as users access the pages, block 35 (of Fig 6) monitors the times of the accesses, in order to identify which versions of each page the user viewed last”). The tracking data is then used to obtain the version of the document/page that was most recently accessed by the user (paragraph 0076-0077: whereas, there are two versions described, such that version 1 is the document of most recently accessed by the identified user, and version 2 is the up-to-date copy of the original. Bell et al’s invention then obtains a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user since, at the time of access for the selected

document/page, "the invention presents version 1, plus the changes which make version 2").

With regards to claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, for *outputting the rendered version to the display device*: Ball et al. inherently teaches that an output device is used to output a rendered version as a screen shot of the rendered version is provided for in Figure 4. Thus, for a user to see the output shown in Figure 4, an output device has been used to output the rendered version.

With regards to claim 16, which is dependent on claim 12, *wherein the selected version of the information object is a current version of the information object and is automatically selected*: The selected information object as indicated in a hotlist is used to inform the external service (computer/server) of the specific page(s) to retrieve from the repository (paragraphs 0042 and 0047-0049: whereas, the repository stores the original documents/pages, and an external service (computer/server) is used to retrieve data from the repository). Furthermore, the computer/server will retrieve the most recent version from the repository and repeatedly run comparison routines (such as CRC or time stamp checks) between the computer/server and the repository (paragraph 0049: whereas, "the invention periodically examines the original (documents/pages) located in the repository for changes" and "In looking for changes, the invention first performs a preliminary check, based on information such as ... dates of modification and ... checksums"). Should a difference be found through a comparison routine, the

computer/server will note the changes and automatically retrieve the latest version from the repository (paragraph 0059: "When user 1 wishes to view page A, the (external service) ordinarily retrieves and presents the current version").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002).

With regards to claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected document/page such that changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is shown through the use of a web browser). Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is

known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

With regards to claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, for *outputting the rendered version to a printing device*: Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected document/page such that changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is presented through the use of a web browser). Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) in view of Warmus et al (US Patent Number: 6,952,801 B2, issued: Oct. 4, 2005, filed: May 10, 2001)

With respect to claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Ball et al. does not teach *encoding information on the stored information in glyphs such that the encoded information designates the version of the information object.*

Warmus et al. however, teaches *encoding information on the stored information in glyphs such that the encoded information designates the version of the information object* (Warmus et al., column 3, lines 60-62: whereas, "the step of specifying page description language instructions to produce a barcode on the page. The barcode may be indicative of tracking information").

Furthermore, Ball et al., and Warmus et al. are from the same problem solving area: Document processing.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Ball et al's storage of page content to further include metadata for the creation of a barcode to identify the information object's version as taught by Warmus et al. The combination of Ball et al. and Warmus et al. would have

allowed Ball et al's version tracking system to be used outside of electronic form so users would have been able to identify and differentiate between different versions of hardcopies.

Claims 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ball et al (US Application: 2002/0120648 A1, published: Aug. 29, 2002, filed: Feb. 15, 2002) in view of Jeffery et al. (US Patent Number: 6,957,384 B2, Issued: Oct. 18, 2005, filed: Dec. 27, 2000).

With regards to claim 7, Ball et al. teaches an apparatus that highlights changes in an information object comprising:

- *A processor that retrieves a selected version of the information object: Obtaining a selected version of an information object requested by the user.* An external service (computer/server which inherently has a processor) is used to access a repository of information including the original set of documents a user may request (paragraph 0049: whereas, the original pages are located in a repository, for which the external service periodically checks against for changes). The external service then collects hotlist information associated with each user, to identify the selected page(s) of interest (paragraph 0048: "a hotlist identifies pages ... as being of interest to (a) user"). The selected page(s) for each user are then obtained (paragraph 0048: whereas, the external service retrieves pages A and B from a repository and stores them in itself).

- *A processor that retrieves the previous version of the information object, the previous version obtained based on the identification:* Anytime there is a change in the original document/page, the external service (computer/server which inherently has a processor) generates a new version number (paragraph 0053-0054: whereas, it is described that "when changes are found, the invention stores them in the external service (computer/server)"). Furthermore, the external service keeps track of the last time a user has accessed a particular document/page (paragraph 0074: whereas, "as users access the pages, block 35 (of Fig 6) monitors the times of the accesses, in order to identify which versions of each page the user viewed last"). The tracking data is then used to obtain the version of the document/page that was most recently accessed by the user (paragraph 0076-0077: whereas, there are two versions described, such that version 1 is the document of most recently accessed by the identified user, and version 2 is the up-to-date copy of the original. The external service then obtains a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user since, at the time of access for the selected document/page, "the invention presents version 1, plus the changes which make version 2"). Thus, the processor has accessed/retrieved version 1 (the previous version of the information object).
- *A delta determination device that determines a difference between the selected version and the previous version:* The external service, determines the difference between two documents through methods such as checking for dates of

modification or checksums (paragraph 0049: The previous version is stored in the external service, and the selected version is retrieved from a repository).

- *A renderer that generates a rendered version of the information object highlighting the difference:* The external service runs a program to produce a rendered version of the information object (such as the one shown in Fig 4, and described in paragraph 0059)". The rendered information object/image "represents changes, and contains material not present in the previous version of the page, but which has been added (paragraph 0061)". Furthermore, highlighting is implemented by including methods such as using a "particular font, particular size, particular color, and particular background (paragraph 0061)".

In addition, Ball et al's external service teaches *identifying a user* as by referring to Figure 5, it is shown that each user is identified such that hot list items are linked to each user. Ball et al further elaborates upon this detail by saying that "the invention maintains a table ... (along with) ... a list of pages or documents, owned by each user (paragraph 0086)". Thus, for a document-to-user mapping be possible, it is inherent that each user has been identified. Furthermore, Ball et al teaches *a request for retrieving an information object* through the use of a user issued hotlist (paragraph 0048: whereas, the hotlist for each user is used to locate the information object). Yet, Ball et al does not expressly teach a *query interface to receive the user identification and request data for the information object*.

Jeffery et al however, teaches a *query interface that receives user identification* (Figure 24: whereas, an interface is shown and a form is used to query the user for a login ID) and *request data for the information object* (Figure 7-1, column 10, lines 2-5: whereas, an interface is shown such that a user is able to click on a specific contract number to request data for that particular contract/information object and "contracts may be displayed and accessed").

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Ball et al's user identification routine to further include the query interface for user identification and information object data request as taught by Jeffery et al. The combination of Ball et al, and Jeffery et al, would have helped Ball et al's invention to "provide a method for storing, organizing and providing remote electronic access to documents" (Jeffery et al, column 2, lines 24-26).

With regards to claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Ball et al teaches *the selected version is a current version of the information object and is automatically selected*: The external service (computer/server which inherently has a processor) obtains the selected information object as indicated in a hotlist from a repository (paragraphs 0042 and 0047-0049: whereas, the repository stores the original documents/pages, and an external service (computer/server) is used to retrieve data from the repository). Furthermore, once the external service retrieves the most recent version from the repository, it will repeatedly run comparison routines (such as CRC or time stamp

checks) on the selected information object stored in the external service and the repository (paragraph 0049: whereas, "the invention periodically examines the original (documents/pages) located in the repository for changes" and "In looking for changes, the invention first performs a preliminary check, based on information such as ... dates of modification and ... checksums"). Should the external service find a difference through the comparison routine, the external service will note the changes and automatically retrieve the latest version from the repository (paragraph 0059: "When user 1 wishes to view page A, the (external service) ordinarily retrieves and presents the current version").

With regards to claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Ball et al teaches *the previous version is a version that was most recently accessed by the user and automatically selected*: Anytime there is a change in the original document/page, the external service (computer/server which inherently has a processor) generates a new version number (paragraph 0053-0054: whereas, it is described that "when changes are found, the invention stores them in the external service (computer/server)"). Furthermore, the external service keeps track of the last time a user has accessed a particular document/page (paragraph 0074: whereas, "as users access the pages, block 35 (of Fig 6) monitors the times of the accesses, in order to identify which versions of each page the user viewed last"). The tracking data is then used to obtain the version of the document/page that was most recently accessed by the user (paragraph 0076-0077: whereas, there are two versions described, such that version 1 is the document of most

recently accessed by the identified user, and version 2 is the up-to-date copy of the original. The external service then obtains a version of the information object that was most recently accessed by the identified user since, at the time of access for the selected document/page, “the invention presents version 1, plus the changes which make version 2”). Thus, the external service automatically chooses to make version 2 by using version 1 as a base to implement changes upon.

With respect to claim 10, which is dependent on claim 7, Ball et al teaches:

- *At least one database that stores the current version and the previous version* (Ball et al, paragraph 0130: whereas, an application called NO HANDS, is used by the external service to help provide users with a way to organize, retrieve, and view differences between pages. Since NO HANDS provides for a collection of information organized in such a way to aid users or a computer program to more efficiently select pieces of data; NO HANDS implements a database). Furthermore, NO HANDS is used to help present the differences between the current and previous versions that are stored in the external service. (paragraph 0131: through one of NO HANDS’ tools called HtmlDiff).
- *An output device that outputs the rendered version:* Ball et al inherently teaches that an output device is used to output a rendered version as a screen shot of the rendered version is provided for in Figure 4. Thus, for a user to see the output shown in Figure 4, an output device has been used to output the rendered version.

With regards to claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Ball et al. teaches the use of an application named HTMLDIFF, which is used to reconstruct the selected document/page such that changes between two versions are marked/highlighted to produce a final output in a HTML document (paragraph 0059, figure 4: whereas, the output is presented through the use of a web browser). Therefore, Ball et al. inherently teaches a *display is used as an output device* in order for the user to view the screen shot of figure 4. Ball et al. however, does not expressly teach *printing the rendered version of the information object on a printing device*. Nevertheless, printing images displayed on a computer screen, such as web pages accessed by a browser, is notoriously well known in the art. The Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this teaching.

It would have thus been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system taught by Ball et al. such that any web pages comprising of the document content and highlighted changes may be printed, as is known in the art. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because a printed copy of a web page is useful, for example, to view or present the web page at a later time when not near a computer or to function as a hardcopy/backup resource.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Yehuda et al. (US Patent Number: 6,266,683, issued: Jul. 24, 2001, filed: Jul. 24, 1997): This patent teaches remote document access, version control, annotations, comments, and “highlighting” of changes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is 571-272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wilson Tsui

Examiner

Art Unit 2178

October 25, 2005

W.T. 1/23/06


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER